lations of the truck weight statute.[6]
A state agency may require that trucking companies keep records vehicle configuration and vehicle weight for the purposes of a use assessment, and if a trucking company fails to keep such records a form acceptable to the department, the agency may assess the mpany at the highest registered maximum gross weight reported.[7]

76 Load, carrying, or seating capacity

search References
est's Key Number Digest, Automobiles ⇦46, 98
ate taxation of motor carriers as affected by commerce clause, 17 A.L.R.2d 421

The amount of the fee or tax to be exacted in connection with the ensing or registration of a motor vehicle may properly be graduated cording to the seating[1] or load or carrying[2] capacity of the vehicle, at ast insofar as the statute providing for the fee or tax is a revenue easure enacted under the taxing power. Such a classification of hicles is reasonable, proper, and valid, as it is based on a uniform, r, and practicable standard.[3] In addition, a motor vehicle license or gistration fee or tax based upon seating[4] or load or carrying[5] capay is not invalid when laid on motor carriers in interstate commerce, there is no discrimination against them in contrast with those gaged in intrastate commerce.

77 Value or age of vehicle

esearch References
est's Key Number Digest, Automobiles ⇦46, 98
ate taxation of motor carriers as affected by commerce clause, 17 A.L.R.2d

---

[6]Department of Public Safety v. reeman Ready-Mix Co., 292 Ala. 380, 95 So. 2d 242 (1974).

As to weight limitations, generally, ee §§ 208 to 213.

[7]D & D Trucking, Inc. v. Idaho ransp. Dept., 126 Idaho 417, 885 P.2d 76 (1994).

Section 76]

[1]Ayres v. City of Chicago, 239 Ill. 37, 87 N.E. 1073 (1909); Iowa Motor ehicle Ass'n v. Board of R.R. Com'rs, 07 Iowa 461, 221 N.W. 364, 75 A.L.R. 1 1928), aff'd, 280 U.S. 529, 50 S. Ct. 151, 4 L. Ed. 595 (1930); Camas Stage Co. v. Kozer, 104 Or. 600, 209 P. 95, 25 A.L.R. 27 (1922).

[2]Richmond Baking Co. v. Department of Treasury, 215 Ind. 110, 18 N.E.2d 778 (1939).

[3]Pine Bluff Transfer Co. v. Nichol, 140 Ark. 320, 215 S.W. 579 (1919).

[4]Northern Kentucky Transp. Co. v. City of Bellevue, 215 Ky. 514, 285 S.W. 241 (1926).

[5]City of Chicago v. Willett Co., 344 U.S. 574, 73 S. Ct. 460, 97 L. Ed. 559 (1953); Hicklin v. Coney, 290 U.S. 169, 54 S. Ct. 142, 78 L. Ed. 247 (1933); Bode v. Barrett, 412 Ill. 204, 106 N.E.2d 521 (1952), judgment aff'd, 344 U.S. 583, 73 S. Ct. 468, 97 L. Ed. 567 (1953).